

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/718,213	JACOBSON-ALTI, JILLIAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Melissa S. Mercier	1615	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Melissa S. Mercier.

(3) Robert Stone.

(2) Kishore Gollamudi.

(4) N/A.

Date of Interview: 10 July 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: N/A.

Claim(s) discussed: all

Identification of prior art discussed: Shanni (US Patent 5631012) Dickens (US 612234)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See below

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


Shanni reference is closest prior art. Mr. Stone pointed out Shanni disclosed a lip pomade. Mr. Stone inquired whether claim 1 with "consisting essentially of" language and claims 7-9 being incorporated would be allowable. The examiner will determine allowability after a new search. However since application is under final, a continuation might be filed. The examiner suggested a divisional process claims might

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Page 2

be filed by applicants. The Examiner
also suggested any unexpected results
which can be submitted are encouraged.


Gollamudi S. Kishore, PhD
Primary Examiner,
Group 1600